

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 remain pending in the application.

**Allowable Claims 1-7**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-7 are ALLOWED.

**Claims 8-17 over Tillgren in view of Bell**

In the Office Action, claims 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,339,706 to Tillgren et al. ("Tillgren") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,600,902 to Bell ("Bell"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 8-17 recite routing an incoming call to a cellular telephone to a remote telephone over a piconet to another telephone device.

The Examiner appears to agree in his RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS that such subject matter is patentable over the prior art, but alleges that such feature is not recited in the rejected claims. While the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner with respect to the presence of the patentable features, claims 8-17 are amended herein to use this exact language so as to purposefully move prosecution along to conclusion.

While it is believed that this language change alone places claims 8-17 in condition for allowance, arguments with respect to distinctions between these claims and the cited prior art are provided.

Tillgren's invention is directed to a system and method of activating an electronic device using voice control technology over a Bluetooth network (See col. 2, lines 1-8 and col. 4, lines 26-32). An incoming call at a mobile telephone is routed to a headset through a Bluetooth connection (See Tillgren, col. 11, lines 57-67). Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest a system and method of routing an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet, much less routing an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet to another telephone device, as recited by claims 8-17.

The Office Action acknowledges that Tillgren fails to disclose a cellular telephone device (See Office Action, page 2). However, the Office Action relies on Bell to allegedly disclose a piconet network that is comprised of piconet-able cellular telephones at col. 4, lines 24-41 and col. 1, lines 8-17 (See Office Action, page 2).

Bell discloses a system and method of implementing a PIN based security system to convey information between Bluetooth capable devices (See col. 6, lines 65). The Bluetooth capable devices are disclosed as comprising being cellular phones (Bell, col. 4, lines 45).

Thus, although the Examiner is correct that Bell discloses a cellular telephone that has Bluetooth capability, Bell's cellular telephone with Bluetooth capability has no relevance to the Applicants' claimed features. Bell's system and method are disclosed as providing security measures for the transfer of data to and from a cellular telephone **NOT** in any way related to routing an **incoming call** to a cellular telephone over a piconet, much less routing an **incoming call** to a cellular telephone over a piconet to **another telephone device**, as recited by claims 8-17.

Even if it were obvious to modify Tillgren with the disclosure of Bell (which it is not), the theoretical result would at best be a system and method of routing an incoming call from a mobile telephone to a headset over a Bluetooth connection (Tillgren), with a Bluetooth enabled cellular phone relying on a PIN to transfer data within the Bluetooth network (Bell). Thus, a theoretically modifying Tillgren would still fail to disclose or suggest routing calls to a cellular telephone over a piconet to **another telephone device**, i.e., a cordless telephone in a PSTN gateway role that allows a remote telephone piconet device to answer an **incoming call** to a cellular telephone over a piconet network, and routing audio from an **incoming call** from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as respectively recited by claims 8-17.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 8-17 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 18-23 over Tillgren in view of Bell, and Wingate**

In the Office Action, claims 18 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Bell, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,978,689 to Tuoriniemi ("Tuoriniemi"); and claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren, Bell, Tuoriniemi AND U.S. Pat. No. 6,006,115 to Wingate ("Wingate"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 18-23 recite routing an incoming call to a wireless telephone over a piconet to another telephone device.

It is believed that the Examiner's comments made in his RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS with respect to the discussion of claims 8-17 relate as well to the amendments made herein to claims 18-23. In particular, claims 18-23 are amended herein to additionally recite routing an incoming call to a wireless telephone over a piconet to another telephone device.

As discussed above, Tillgren, Touriniemi and Bell fail to teach or suggest routing an incoming call to a wireless telephone over a piconet to another telephone device as claimed by claims 18-23.

The FOURTH reference cited by the Examiner as allegedly being combined by a person of skill in the art to arrive at the present invention with respect to claim 19 alone relates to a teaching of ringing both a phone and a remote device.

Wingate is relied on, and appears to disclose, a wireless headphone that is able to sound an alert of an incoming call (See col. 4, lines 15-54). Alternately, the wireless headphone can mute sound at the headphone to allow a user to hear ringing at a base unit of a cordless telephone (See Wingate, col. 4, lines 14-54). However, Wingate fails to disclose or suggest any type of piconet use, much less a method for selectively audibly ringing a remote telephone piconet device based on incoming call related information received by a wireless telephone, as recited by claim 19.

Therefore, even if it were obvious to modify Tillgren with the disclosure of Bell, Tuoriniemi and Wingate (which it is not), the theoretical result would fail to use call related information with a piconet device, much less disclose or suggest a method for selectively audibly ringing a remote telephone piconet device based on incoming call related information received by a wireless telephone, as recited by claim 19. Accordingly, the theoretical combination of the FOUR references Tillgren, Bell, Tuoriniemi and Wingate fails to disclose, teach or suggest ROUTING an INCOMING CALL to a wireless telephone over a piconet to another telephone device, as claimed by claim 19.

Moreover, claims 18 and 20-23 further recite an apparatus and method for selectively audibly ringing a remote telephone piconet device based on incoming call related information received by a wireless telephone.

As discussed above, Tillgren's invention is directed to a system and method of activating an electronic device using voice control technology over a Bluetooth network (See col. 2, lines 1-8 and col. 4, lines 26-32). An incoming call at a mobile telephone is routed to a headset through a Bluetooth connection (See Tillgren, col. 11, lines 57-67). However, Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest the use of call related information by any of the devices within the system, much less disclose or suggest an apparatus and method for selectively audibly ringing a remote telephone piconet device based on incoming call related information received by a wireless telephone, as recited by claims 18 and 20-23.

The Office Action acknowledges that Tillgren fails to disclose a cellular telephone or a ring (See Office Action, page 4). The Office Action relies on Bell and Tuoriniemi to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, Bell discloses a system and method of implementing a PIN based security system to convey information between Bluetooth capable devices (See col. 6, lines 65). The Bluetooth capable devices are disclosed as comprising cellular phones (Bell, col. 4, lines 45). However, Bell, like Tillgren, fails to disclose or suggest the use of call related information by any of the devices within the system, much less disclose or

suggest an apparatus and method for selectively audibly ringing a remote telephone piconet device based on incoming call related information received by a wireless telephone, as recited by claims 18 and 20-23.

Tuoriniemi appears to disclose a method and system for allowing a user to listen to a digital audio device through a headset while being alerted to a telephone call received by a cellular telephone (Figs. 1, 5 and 7; col. 4, lines 14-54).

Tuoriniemi discloses a system that allows a user, while listening to an audio source such as a radio broadcast, to also hear a telephone ring to answer an incoming call through a common headset. Although Tuoriniemi discloses use of call related information to announce an incoming call (See col. 11, lines 50-67), Tuoriniemi fails to disclose any type of apparatus having piconet capability. Thus, Tuoriniemi fails to disclose a telephone piconet device, much use of call related information to selectively ring a piconet device, as recited by claims 18 and 20-23.

Therefore, even if it were obvious to modify Tillgen with the disclosure of Bell and Tuoriniemi, the theoretical result would fail to use call related information with a piconet device, much less an apparatus and method for selectively audibly ringing a remote telephone piconet device based on incoming call related information received by a wireless telephone, as recited by claims 18 and 20-23.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 18-23 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Will Bollman", written over a horizontal line.

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington D.C. 20036-3307